

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 131751
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-13 ACDA-12 ISO-00 PM-05 SP-02 NSC-05
DODE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15
ICA-11 TRSE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 ICAE-00 INRE-00
HA-05 /095 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:WSHINN,JR.:LA
APPROVED BY EUR:EGOODBY
NSC:RHUNTER C:RHOPPER
DOD/ISA:MR. KOMER
DOD/ISA:JREED
EUR/SE: CEWING
PM: SSTENER
NEA:MR. ARTHINSEN
ACDA:DCLEONARD
S/P:MR. KAPLAN
-----095556 240356Z /20

O 240035Z MAY 78
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS IMMEDIATE
USMISSION GENEVA
AMEMBASSY MADRID
USDEL MBFR VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 131751

GENEVA FOR US SALT DEL

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: NAC, NATO, PORG

SUBJECT: INSTRUCTIONS ON SUMMIT COMMUNIQUE: DFC/2

REF: (A) USNATO 5;59; (B) ATHENS 4214 (C) USNATO 5218
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 131751

1. WE FIND THE SECOND DRAFT OF THE COMMUNIQUE A MARKED
IMPROVEMENT OVER THE FIRST. WE AGREE THAT SOME
DISTORTION IN PRESENTATION IS INEVITABLE BECAUSE OF THE
LTDP ISSUE.

2. YOU SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE GUIDED BY EXISTING

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE LTDP. IN PARTICULAR, WE SEE NO REASON WHY IT SHOULD NOT BE MENTIONED IN PARA 3 OF DFC/2 IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LONDON FORMULA. THIS IS, AFTER ALL, THE WAY THAT MBFR HAS BEEN HANDLED IN NATO COMMUNIQUE FOR MANY YEARS.

3. WE AGREE WITH YOUR SUGGESTED TACTICS ON HANDLING THE DUTCH HUMAN RIGHTS PROPOSAL IN PARA 8. HOWEVER, WE HAVE NO DIFFICULTY WITH THIS CSCE PARA AS PRESENTLY DRAFTED.

4. WE AGREE WITH YOUR SUGGESTIONS ON HANDLING THE TURKISH PROPOSAL TO CONDUCT A STUDY ON AID TO PORTUGAL AND TURKEY. WE HAVE NO OBJECTIONS TO A STUDY PER SE BUT BELIEVE IT IS NOT COMMUNIQUE MATERIAL.

5. CONCERNING THE GREEK-TURKISH DISPUTES OVER PARAGRAPHS 13-14, WE WISH TO AVOID ACRIMONIOUS DISCUSSION AT THE HEADS OF DELEGATION LEVEL AS HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST. IN ADDITION, TIME CONSTRAINTS APPEAR NOW TO MAKE IT DESIRABLE THAT GREEKS AND TURKS HAVE ASSISTANCE OUTSIDE FORMAL SPC DISCUSSION. THUS, CONCERNING PARAGRAPH 14, WE BELIEVE MISSION SHOULD APPROACH TURKS AFTER CHECKING WITH INTERNATIONAL STAFF TO NOTE: (A) WHILE WE WOULD OF COURSE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO A REFERENCE IN THE NAC COMMUNIQUE TO ADMINISTRATION EFFORT TO LIFT ARMS EMBARGO, WE RECOGNIZE THAT THE PRESENT VERSION WITH ITS SPECIFIC REFERENCE IS POLITICALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR GREEKS; (B) THERE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 131751

IS ALREADY SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO LIFTING ARMS EMBARGO IN DPC COMMUNIQUE; (C) STRICT INSISTENCE BY TURKS ON PRESENT LANGUAGE COULD RESULT IN COMPLETE DELETION OF REFERENCE TO EMBARGO REPEAL; AND (D) WE WOULD HOPE THEREFORE THAT TURKS AND GREEKS COULD GET TOGETHER WITH INTERNATIONAL STAFF ON PARAGRAPH 14 IN EFFORT TO ARRIVE AT COMPROMISE. IF PROBED, MISSION MAY SUGGEST THAT ALTERNATIVE PARAGRAPH 14 REPORTED REFTEL B APPEARS TO OFFER BASIS FOR NEGOTIATION BETWEEN CONCERNED ALLIES. FYI: WE WOULD SEE GREEK ALTERNATIVE AS ADEQUATE COMPROMISE WITH FOLLOWING CHANGES: (A) INSERTION OF "AND READINESS" BETWEEN "SOLIDARITY" AND "OF ITS MEMBERS"; (B) SUBSTITUTION OF "ACTIONS" FOR "PROBLEMS" END FYI. AS FOR PARAGRAPH 13, IT SEEMS THAT GREEK AND TURKISH VERSIONS ARE NOT REALLY FAR APART AND PROBABLY CAN BE RESOLVED BY CONTINUED ALLIED PRODDING OF TWO DELEGATIONS TO GET TOGETHER.

6. WE HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH DROPPING THE WORDS "EXPRESS THE HOPE THAT THIS PROCESS WILL NOT FALTER" IN THE MIDDLE EAST PARA. YOU SHOULD CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR RETENTION OF THE REMAINING LANGUAGE.

7. WE HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THE CANADIAN REPLACEMENT FOR THE FIRST NINE LINES OF PARA 16. WE THINK THE LAST SENTENCE WOULD READ BETTER HOWEVER, AS FOLLOWS: "BUT THEY CANNOT, OF COURSE, RELY ON ASSURANCES ALONE."

8. OUR INTENTION IN THE SALT PARAGRAPH WAS TO HAVE AN UNAMBIGUOUS STATEMENT OF ALLIED CONFIDENCE IN OUR CONDUCT OF THE NEGOTIATION. WE THOUGHT THE DECEMBER 1977 LANGUAGE, WHILE ADMITTEDLY VERY POSITIVE, DID NOT COMPLETELY CONVEY THIS CONFIDENCE. IN PARTICULAR IT WAS NOT CLEAR THAT ALLIED SUPPORT WAS FOR THE SPECIFIC AGREEMENT WE ARE NEGOTIATING OR WHETHER IT WAS FOR ONE WHICH SATISFIED AS YET UNDETERMINED ALLIED STANDARDS. FRANKLY, WE ARE CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 131751

SOMEWHAT PUZZLED BY THE REMARKS OF THE ALLIES ON OUR NEW TEXT. THERE IS NOTHING IN IT ABOUT STRENGTHENING "DETENTE" ALTHOUGH WE WOULD ARGUE THIS COULD WELL BE A RESULT. WE HAVE NO IDEA WHAT "SURPRISINGLY LAPIDARY" MEANS. AS FOR THE GERMAN REMARK, IT IS NOT STRATEGIC STABILITY WHICH STRENGTHENS DETERRENCE IN OUR TEXT BUT THE OVERALL AGREEMENT. SINCE OUR PURPOSE IS TO SUPPORT SALT PUBLICLY THROUGH A STRONG ALLIED ENDORSEMENT WE PREFER TO USE LANGUAGE AT LEAST DIFFERENT FROM AND HOPEFULLY MORE POSITIVE THAN THAT IN THE LAST MINISTERIAL COMMUNIQUE.

9. ON MBFR SECTION, PREVIOUS GUIDANCE REMAINS VALID. REGARDING PROPOSED FRG REWRITE (USNATO 5137), IT SUBSTANTIALLY MEETS OUR CRITERIA (STATE 126717) FOR DEALING WITH THE OWEN PROPOSAL FOR A REFERENCE TO A BRIEF MBFR FOREIGN MINISTERS' MEETING BUT IS OVERLY TECHNICAL AND NEEDS POLISHING. YOU SHOULD NOT PRESS IT OVER OPPOSITION FROM OTHER ALLIES OR OTHERWISE TAKE LEAD IN DISCUSSION OF THE OWEN PROPOSAL.

10. ON PARA 19 OUR FALLBACK WILL BE TO TRADE DELETION OF CTB LANGUAGE FOR RETENTION OF NON-PROLIFERATION LANGUAGE. YOU MAY USE THIS FALLBACK WHEN YOU BELIEVE THE TIMING IS MOST SUITED TO ACHIEVE SUCCESS WITH IT. YOU SHOULD, OF COURSE, DISCUSS THIS WITH THE BRITISH AND PERHAPS WITH OTHER INTERESTED DELEGATIONS FIRST. OUR RATIONALE FOR THE FALLBACK IS THAT THE CTB IS NOT LIKELY TO BE HELPED BY REFERENCE IN THE COMMUNIQUE, WHEREAS MENTION OF NON-PROLIFERATION COULD ADVANCE OUR OBJECTIVES IN THAT AREA. THE NON-PROLIFERATION SENTENCE AS PRESENTLY DRAFTED IS THE BARE MINIMUM THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 131751

NEEDED.

11. CONCERNING REFTEL (C) JUST RECEIVED, PARAGRAPH 13-14 LANGUAGE TO BE PROPOSED BY ITALIANS WOULD ALSO BE ACCEPTABLE TO US.

12. FOLLOWING GUIDANCE IS ON UNBRACKETED LANGUAGE OF DFC/2. IN PARA 4, YOU SHOULD PROPOSE DELETING "IN ALL POSSIBLE FIELDS," AS IT IS TOO VAGUE AND OPEN-ENDED. THE LAST SENTENCE OF THIS PARA IS VIRTUALLY DUPLICATED BY MIDDLE OF PARA 7. WE WOULD SUGGEST DELETING FIRST PART OF THE SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 7 SO IT READS: "THEY REAFFIRMED THEIR VIEW...." IN PARA 20 ON SSOD WE WOULD

PREFER TO DELETE THIRD SENTENCE ON DECISIONS BY CONSENSUS AS IT SEEMS EXCESSIVELY DEFENSIVE ON THIS POINT. IN PARA 5, YOU SHOULD PROPOSE CHANGING „DISREGARD FOR THE INDIVISIBILITY OF" TO "A SELECTIVE APPROACH TO "DETENTE...."

13. WE HAVE JUST RECEIVED USNATO 5217 WITH NEW LANGUAGE ON THE TRANS-ATLANTIC DIALOGUE FOR PARA 21. WE HAVE NO SUBSTANTIVE PROBLEM WITH IT BUT BELIEVE IT IS RATHER ACKWARD AND STILTED. WE SUGGEST AN EFFORT BE MADE TO GIVE IT LIFT.

CHRISTOPHER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: INSTRUCTIONS, ALLIANCE, COMMUNIQUE
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 24 may 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978STATE131751
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: WSHINN,JR.:LA
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780218-0275
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780523/aaaaatjr.tel
Line Count: 202
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 78184597-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 78 USNATO 5, 78 ATHENS 4214, 78 USNATO 5218
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 31 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2585522
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: INSTRUCTIONS ON SUMMIT COMMUNIQUE: DFC/2
TAGS: PORG, NAC, NATO
To: USNATO
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/78184597-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014